

333
of
at
use
the
by
en-
and
(er),
rg,
(h),
er-
(d),
sse
aus
pf
sa
in
inst
ow
o's
ust
to
ow
to
ors
am
et
is-
he
ed
a
in
se
is,
pe
m
to
lo
ra
la
n-

ANALOGUE
CENTRAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF TORONTO LIBRARY

April 28, 1930

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXIII, No. 23

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1930

WHOLE NO. 634

The new THIRD LATIN BOOK by

B. L. ULLMAN

Professor of Latin,
University of Chicago

NORMAN E. HENRY

Instructor of Latin
Peabody High School, Pittsburgh

DORRANCE S. WHITE

Assistant Professor of Latin,
University of Iowa

will

Uphold in every way the aims of the Macmillan Classical Series of which it will form a part.

Meet all the requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board.

Embody the authors' customary high standards of pedagogy.

Follow the beautiful and readable typographic form of the Second Latin, Revised.

Carry on the high standards of the entire series for strong, beautiful bookmaking.

* Conform to the report of the Classical Investigation.

Repeat in its rich red-brown cover stamped in gold the distinctive and durable garb of the other Ullman and Henry books.

Contain more than one hundred unusual illustrations, consistent with the quality of the illustrations in the other books.

Provide an innovation in content fully in accord with the recommendations of the Classical Investigation and with the progressive movement in Third-Year Latin study everywhere.

The Third Latin Book diverges widely from the traditional Ciceronian diet formerly given to Latin students in their third year. From classical literature suited in subject and difficulty to students of this level selections have been made which will develop maximum facility in reading the language, together with maximum appreciation of Roman life and culture.

To be published soon.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

N
O
W
R
E
A
D
Y

THIS new edition of a widely-used Virgil meets the new requirements for entrance into College, based on the recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation. It is handsomely bound, with cover and title page by the noted artist, Rudolph Ruzicka, and with many interesting illustrations, including a frontispiece in four colors.

Ginn and Company's
Beautiful New Bimillennial
Edition of the
Greenough-Kittredge-Jenkins
VIRGIL

THE selections are remarkable for their variety, interest, and simplicity. In addition to the first six books of the Aeneid, there are over 1800 lines from Ovid (Metamorphoses, Fasti, Heroides, Tristia), Horace (Odes), Catullus, Tibullus, and Virgil (Georgics). The passages in the latter part of the book are particularly suitable for sight reading.

Many teachers will also be interested to know that there is available a limited supply of Ginn and Company's "Kalendarium Vergilianum", which was sold only recently by the American Classical League for twenty-five cents a copy. Ginn and Company will be very glad to send a copy of this calendar, with their compliments, to any teacher of Latin who may apply before this limited supply is exhausted.

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 23

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1930

WHOLE NO. 634

PROFESSOR LODGE'S RETIREMENT

On February 1 last, Dr. Gonzales Lodge retired as Professor of Greek and Latin at Teachers College, Columbia University. He had served that Institution in this capacity since July 1, 1900.

Since every reader of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* is well aware of Professor Lodge's high standing as a scholar, and since many readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* know from personal experience his extraordinary gifts as a teacher, the announcement made in the preceding paragraph will make it clear at once to them all what a grievous loss the cause of the Classics in the United States has sustained in his retirement.

Since I was for nearly thirty years Professor Lodge's colleague, and since for more than twenty-five years he has honored me with his intimate friendship, his retirement brings to me personally a sense of loss which I could find no words to express, even if this were the proper place to give expression to that sense of loss.

As Editor of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, however, I cannot let Professor Lodge's retirement go unnoticed. For the first six years of the existence of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, that is during the years when the work of conducting the paper was in certain ways harder than it has been in the succeeding years, Professor Lodge was Editor-in-Chief. He retired from that position of his own accord in 1913.

I can think of no better way in which *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* can mark the retirement of Professor Lodge and at the same time express in some slight measure the feeling which all readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* will have in connection with his retirement than to reprint two papers which Professor Lodge published in the early years of his connection with Teachers College. These two papers have not been readily accessible to students of the Classics. One of them has long been out of print. Every one who reads these articles will instantly realize how valuable they were and are. As I have read them over again from time to time in the years that have intervened since their publication, and more especially as I have read them over several times in connection with their republication in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, I have realized again and again how immeasurably superior they are to most, if not to all, of the other articles that have been published on Caesar in this country in the last thirty years. I believe that Lord Macaulay once described a horse race essentially as follows, "Eclipse first, the rest nowhere". Long years ago I read somewhere an interesting story in connection with the race by which the famous America Cup passed into the custody of Americans. As I recall the story, Queen Victoria asked John Brown, her devoted servitor, "Which yacht is first?" "The America, your Majesty". "Which

yacht is second?" "There is no second, your Majesty". These two stories, by the way, are modern versions of something which Cicero says in his *Brutus* (173): *Duobus igitur summis, Crasso et Antonio, L. Philippus proximus accedebat, sed longo intervallo tamen proximus, itaque eum... neque secundum... neque tertium dixerim, nec enim in quadrigis eum secundum numeraverim... qui vix e carceribus exierit cum palmam iam primus accepit, nec in oratoribus qui tantum absit a primo vix ut in eodem curriculo esse videatur.*

CHARLES KNAPP

IMAGINATION IN THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS¹

In choosing this subject I was not insensible of the wide range that it covers, nor of the impossibility of treating it at all adequately during the short time that I shall occupy your attention. But it seemed to me that, by discussing very briefly a few aspects, I might at the same time voice a protest against what appear to me wrong tendencies, and offer a suggestion for a possible betterment in our teaching.

In view of the great inroads made in recent years, under the stress of modern progress, into the territory formerly controlled by the classics, various means have been suggested whereby the lost ground might be recovered or, at least, further encroachment might be prevented; and these have applied not only to the secondary school, but also to the college instruction. It has been urged that, in selecting a teacher, we must have regard not merely to the command of the subject that the candidate displays, but in particular to his personality, his ability to impart instruction in a clear and simple manner, and above all, to his power to command the interest of his students, so that learning may no longer be a task to which an unwilling boy must be driven by the lash of the schoolmaster, but a pleasure, the eager enjoyment of which, owing to the fascinating way in which it is presented, needs to be rather restrained than stimulated. In brief, the instructor must interest his students.

Various means have been suggested to induce interest. A large amount of the time of the class is to be devoted to Roman and Greek antiquities and private life. When a classic like Caesar is being interpreted, the assistance of the engraver and photographer is to be drawn into requisition, and we must have a picture of every important scene! If the work is one of more evident literary merit, as epic poetry, then numismatics must be drawn upon for coins, art must be invoked for gems, and antiquities must be

¹An address delivered before the Schoolmasters' Association of New York, January 12, 1901. <This paper was published in the *Educational Review* 22, (September, 1901), 162-170. This periodical, long successfully conducted by President Nicholas Murray Butler, ceased, under other editorship, to exist a year or so ago. C. K. >

sought to illustrate every object that is referred to in the text. At convenient times the stereopticon must be employed, while the parallel with modern literature must be introduced, especially with more advanced students, tho not with them only, if a recent edition of Ovid may be regarded as showing the popular taste.

The value of all these devices I should not desire for a moment to impugn; but, with the exception of the modern parallel, it is to be observed that all of them are extraneous matters, brought in to enliven not so much by interpretation as by distraction. They do not conduce, except in rare instances, to the better understanding of the text, and, except in so far as they give larger breadth of view, do not materially assist in the learning of the languages. My question, therefore, is: How can these latter elements, the text and the language, be employed as in themselves interesting means of instruction?

Without going into the question as to whether language has an organic life—whether it is born, grows, decays, and dies of itself, or whether it depends upon the conventions of its users, the old question as to whether language is *φύσις* or *θέσις*—we must not lose sight of the fact that each language has its own peculiarities, inasmuch as it is the expression of the gradually unfolding life of the people who used it; and above all, that literature is the creation of the master minds of men, with elements of permanence and eternity directly proportioned to the intellectual vigor of the creators: worthy of study for elevating purposes only so far as those who wrote had thoughts higher, nobler, greater than those who read.

I shall accordingly draw your attention to two main points where I think some progress is to be made: first, the material; second, the form.

With regard to the first I shall take as my point of departure a remark made by a friend of mine recently: "When I read Caesar I was not taught that he was a great man, or that the *Commentaries* were a masterpiece of literature, or even a political pamphlet, but only that it was Latin."

Such an experience has been only too common, but there has been some excuse for it. In the teaching of modern languages, the various reading books first put into the hands of the young are made up of passages selected with due reference to the stage of development of the pupil. The same used to be more true with Greek and Latin, and in the beginning Aesop's *Fables* were a standard book for beginners. Later the material was enlarged by the addition of the *Viri Romae*, a book much simpler, to be sure, than normal Latin, but still not a child's book by any means. The difficulty is that the classical literatures are in their contents creations of the greatest men of their respective races, written in every case for mature minds, with no thought that they might be used as schoolbooks, and beyond the unassisted intelligence of the most of those who study them at the time they are introduced to them. This will be admitted at once in the case of the great literary departments of drama and philosophy—and, in a lesser degree, of the epic. But that it is just as true in the matter of history, with which it is customary to

begin instruction, will be evident from a few considerations.

The art of writing history scientifically, simply as the application of scientific method to which the writer has devoted himself, is essentially modern. The ancient historian had a purpose quite different from the record of objective fact. Sometimes he was convinced that he saw more clearly into the laws which governed the course of historical events (in this respect approaching nearly to the modern ideal), or appreciated more deeply than others the value of a particular period in the general progress of mankind. From this he drew his mission to preserve a narrative of events properly interpreted for the benefit of later men. Such was the attitude of Thucydides, or of Sallust. Other historians were imbued with the love of story-telling, and conceived the best field for this to be the historical field, as Herodotus. Others were fascinated with the panorama of a particular life or period, as Tacitus. Others would spur a degenerate posterity to improvement by recalling the glorious deeds of their ancestors, as Livy. Finally certain historians have felt it necessary to make a defense of their own actions, by setting them forth in favorable light, for their fellow-citizens to read and judge. Such were Xenophon and, pre-eminently, Caesar.

It thus appears that, in the study of any ancient historian, due allowance must be made for the personality of the author, as shown in his work or as found out from other sources. Due account must be taken of his aim, and also, particularly, of his aim as conditioned by the time in which he lived. For no matter how careful he may have been to attempt to view events from the objective point of view, he always falls far short of it, owing partly to the personal bias and partly to the spirit of his age. No better example of this can be cited than that of Tacitus.

The opinion that the world has of the Emperor Tiberius is due entirely to the account in Tacitus' *Annals*. Suetonius and Dio Cassius have contributed something, but for the interpretation of the character of the man Tacitus has been the authority. Now Tacitus made it his boast that he was unprejudiced, and narrated only that which was unquestionably true; and the most careful recent study has only served to confirm this statement in every detail. Tacitus has not exaggerated or wrested the facts; he has scrupulously recorded the events of the emperor's life without interpretation—so scrupulously that those who have striven to rehabilitate his character have drawn mainly upon Tacitus' own account for material. Tacitus has been modified and moderated by Tacitus alone. How is it, then, that the world has arisen from the reading of Tacitus with loathing for what it conceived to have been the greatest monster that ever sat upon a throne?

The explanation lies in the art of the historian, resting upon his own personality; art none the less magnificent that it was unconscious, none the less effective that it was undesigned. Therefore, the teacher of Tacitus fails of his duty toward his students if he does not make this art clear to them.

But the historical narrative, to be properly interpreted, must be studied not only with due regard to the author's personality, but also from the point of view of universal history—in which this small portion is but an episode. For this we have to thank our modern historical friends. When I was a boy the main requirement in my study of history was to memorize a large number of dates. Even yet there are plenty of uses for chronological charts of all kinds, and these dates have their inestimable value as forming the skeleton on which is raised the beautiful figure of the philosophy of history. But in themselves they are inanimate; they must be clothed with the flesh and blood of motive and action, of daring and deed, and they must be given proportion and color, and must be brought into harmonious relation with each other, before they fulfill their proper function.

In the lives of those about us we know that almost every tangible mark of progress is not so simple as it appears to be. It is frequently the culmination of long and arduous labor, accompanied by the pleasures of hope or the pains of disappointment, suffering, and sometimes despair.

What is true of the miniature world of the individual is true of the larger world of the nation—or of the still larger world of humanity. Trite, but none the less cogent, examples are the French Revolution and the Discovery of America. The great carnival of blood in the year 1789 was but the culmination of tendencies that were inherited from the Middle Ages, and due in large measure to the development in the government in France. Feudalism and all its train of evils, the rise of absolutism, together with the great expansion of the monarchy both in Europe and across the sea; the large increase in the parasitic classes and the difficulties of financial mismanagement—all had their full fruition in the Revolution. It is not important how it began, whether from the caprice of a courtesan or from the failure of a harvest; the true interpretation must be sought in the past and the long series of events which led up to it.

The discovery of America in 1492 may be similarly interpreted. It was impressed upon my mind as a child that, whatever else I forgot, I should remember this date. Patriotic pride had something to do with it, but I know now that the instinct (for it was but little more) of my teachers was not at fault. For I have since learned that this discovery was in its turn the result of long efforts, hopes, and dreams—inevitable sooner or later in the world's growth, as have been all other steps in progress. What Plato saw with prophetic vision; what Seneca felt dimly after; what the clearer-eyed man of science came to regard as certain from the fixed laws of mathematics; what the sage and adventurer both suffered long for without losing hope—all this culminated in 1492. The persistence of faith thru difficulties and persecution, the hostility of kings, the tenderness of queens, the suspicions of the Church, the calculations of the merchant, the inspiration of the adventurer—these are all involved in the date 1492. That the search for a northwest passage was the immediate cause is not important. But the interpre-

tation of this point in the world's history means all that I have said.

Coming nearer to our own field, we must interpret the *Commentaries* of Caesar in the same way. The Gallic war was more than a series of campaigns to conquer the various peoples of Gaul; it was more than an important period in the life of a Roman politician. It was the time when the angel of history wrote opposite the glorious roll of the Roman republic the fatal words, "It is finished." It was the war that made necessary and at the same time possible the establishment of the Roman empire; and thru it of our present civilization, being in itself the final stage of a *régime* that was passing away, and a leveling period to clear the way for the growth that was to come; it was the reaping, like the French Revolution, of long sowings to the wind. It mattered not from this point of view just what the immediate cause was, even if it was the geological conformation of southeastern France; it is the result that concerns us.

In a similar way the *Annals* of Tacitus to which I referred show the completion of what the Gallic war began; the fixing of the results for which Caesar fought. And Tacitus gains a fuller glory from this wide interpretation.

All this is in a manner external to the actual style of the historian—and it is in this latter point that there is so much shortcoming in our teaching. All the peculiarities of the historian's temperament, as well as his interpretation of events, their relative importance and relation, are shown in his style. It is not an uncommon thing for a historical work to be dramatized; for if the historian is at the same time in temperament an artist, he cannot fail to catch the most striking and important situations and elaborate them proportionately. In this way the history becomes a series of scenes of greater or less prominence, on a thread of advancing narrative. Marches, sieges, battles, councils are parts of the machinery by which the scenes are presented and the chief figures brought into view. Some of these historians possess this dramatic power in a higher degree than others, and in some it extends not only to individual scenes, but even to whole episodes.

An example of the latter is shown by the third decade of Livy, and at the same time nothing could be more effective to mark the difference between the guide-book historian and the artistic one. Scholars have written reams of heavy articles on the credibility of Livy's history; have discussed and rediscussed just where Hannibal crossed the Alps; have made merry of the vinegar story, and of many other details. What of all this? Livy had never been over the ground; had perhaps never seen the Alps; certainly had never crossed them; had in all probability never seen most of the Italian districts which were the scene of war. What of that? Neither his purpose nor the success with which he accomplished it was affected by that. He was painting a battle of giants, and what they stood on was of no moment to him.

Studying the whole third decade, we find that the prominent figure at the beginning of the 21st book is Hannibal. In every way possible are we made to feel

that he is one of the stars in the cast. We are skillfully put into sympathy with him by the stories of his early life,—and at the same time we are made to recognize his transcendent military genius by the operations he carries on. The passage of the Alps is portrayed in all its details to enhance the figure of Hannibal, and after it is accomplished, and the hero stands on the plains of Italy, Livy is only putting into words what we all feel when Scipio meets him near the Po. Hear what Livy says: "The two armies were now abreast in full view of each other, and their generals had met; not yet well acquainted with each other, to be sure, but each one already thrilled with a feeling of admiration for his opponent. For the name of Hannibal had been famous at Rome even before the sack of Saguntum, and Hannibal regarded Scipio as distinguished for the very reason that he particularly had been chosen to take the field against himself. This mutual respect they had each increased, Scipio by having thrown himself in Hannibal's way—instead of departing for Gaul; Hannibal by his bold attempt to cross the Alps—and its accomplishment." No wonder the narrator halts here for speeches on both sides. "Stay your course," Livy says in effect to his Muse, "and let us contemplate this man, see his elements of greatness, and his faults, and let us learn wherein his great superiority consisted." In this same battle an obscure part is taken by a young man named Scipio—so obscure that the accounts disagree about it. Livy tells the tale very briefly, almost as a footnote, but he gives the audience a hint to watch this same obscure character. "This is to be the youth who is to have the glory of having brought the war to an end, Africanus, named for his great victory over Hannibal and the Carthaginians." Whether it was in this battle or some other that Scipio actually took part, or whether he really did save the consul's life, is not the point at issue. Livy's artistic purpose required that Scipio should enter here. With this beginning the drama begins to unfold, and tableau after tableau is flashed upon the sight. Hannibal stalks supreme thru five books, and yet there is an uneasy feeling of suspense; something is sure to happen. In the 26th book this obscure young man comes forward as aedile, before his time; the warning given five books ago is repeated, and we begin to watch events. Alongside of the first great star gradually develops the second, and as his magnitude grows and grows we wait almost with bated breath for the catastrophe. This is most skillfully provided for, and in the fullness of time takes place. In the 30th book the summons comes to Hannibal to leave Italy, where he has been for sixteen weary years, and the great scene of the war is the meeting of the two generals before Zama.

Here again the narrative halts and the world withdraws a while, and Hannibal and Scipio meet for the first and last time, face to face, in a lonely place between the armies. Is it any wonder that the third decade of Livy was never divided, but comes to us entire, being, as it is, one of the most perfect creations of ancient art? No drama in form is superior to it in

interest. And no work ever pointed its moral for the instruction of nations better.

In a similar way the *Anabasis* should be regarded. Dürrbach, it seems to me, is unquestionably right in maintaining that the *Anabasis* is an apology for his conduct by Xenophon. If the work was written with a particular aim, we have lost a great part of it if we are not prepared to recognize this aim. In Caesar, too, we have the same kind of a work; and the same degree of skill is shown by each, tho in a different way. Both have the trick of speaking always of themselves in the third person. While this has been variously interpreted, it seems to me that the reason undoubtedly was to lull to rest any sense of personal pleading which the first-person pronoun would have been sure to rouse; and thus to prepare the way for the accentuation of the dominant note. Every page rings with the name of Xenophon, of Caesar. Print these names in capitals, and see how the book is illustrated. Battles rage, and the elements vaunt themselves. There are treachery and open rebellion; but the countless storms that hurry across these pages leave the mountain peaks of Caesar and Xenophon always serenely dominant. The Gauls came to believe that the Romans were invincible if Caesar were present, and their most formidable uprising took place when he was away. This dominating effect would have been rendered much more difficult by the use of the first-person pronoun. So these two works should be interpreted as heroic histories with the central figure always the hero,—side acts enough, "glory enough for all,"—but above all we should not lose sight, in Caesar's case, of the rising demigod; in Xenophon, of the lofty patriot.

But I have dwelt enough on the large interpretation. Let me say a few words as to the minute. The historian of the type we have been considering differs from the dramatic poet largely in the style, not in the spirit. The necessary marches and countermarches, the fortifications and foragings, must all be told in their proper order and detail. Descriptions of localities must be inserted for the better understanding of the military operations. In the drama all these are avoided, and the stage carpenter and the scene painter relieve the poet of all responsibility except for the delineation of the character and the management of the scene. Are we to suppose that Livy, Tacitus, Xenophon, Herodotus were any the less sensible of the histrionic value of what they wrote than the dramatists themselves? By no means. In fact, how sensible they were of the scenic effect is seen in the number of speeches they insert, as well as the extreme care with which they attempt to make words take the place of the acts or gesture. Consequently we must expect to find on every page of Caesar a picture; on every page of Livy or Xenophon a scene; and it is our business as teachers to see that our pupils observe what we observe. If we are roused to the highest pitch of enthusiasm at a brilliant piece of sword play on the stage, shall we fail to feel the same when pair after pair of captives fight to the death before Hannibal's army? Nor are these cases ever left without artistic treatment by the author;

and sometimes he is not content with a passing sketch leaving the imagination of the teacher to fill out the details, but actually gives us the fully wrought-out picture. Take the deeds of Pullus and Vorenus in the *Bellum Gallicum*, V. xliv. A whole chapter is given up to the narrative, and this chapter is thrice the ordinary length. The story is begun properly with a couple of sentences introducing these heroes. Then the rapid narrative begins with the employment of the historical present, and for nearly twenty-five lines the fighting goes on—continually in historical presents (the tense used especially for the lively representation of the past) until the scene is finished—when a quiet aorist closes the story, and we pass on to the other events in the siege. This whole passage shows no tenses but historical present, and there are twenty-three cases of it—something almost unexampled in Latin. The teacher who does not make this fight real before the very eyes of his pupils is doing justice neither to Caesar nor to them.

To take another very well-known passage. Observe how Xenophon spends himself in the *θάλαττα* scene, *Anabasis* IV.vii.22. It would have been possible for him to relate the occurrence in the most matter-of-fact way. Instead, he makes it most intensely dramatic. We find the Greeks jogging along in the most careless fashion, avoiding ambuscades and capturing rawhide shields—about twenty in number. The shout in the van that had first drawn their languid attention was now growing fuller and nearer, and the advancing lines begin to show commotion, and one runs, and another runs, and the shouting becomes greater, and the crowd becomes still more dense; and Xenophon and his captains, fearing everything, put their horses at full speed to bear assistance, if need be. When they get near enough to hear, the word is *θάλαττα*, and it passes down the line, tossed from one eager mouth to another. Then they all run, says Xenophon, and the rearguard must not be left behind, and the enthusiasm extends to the beasts of burden, and they come charging up; and the horses, too, will not be restrained from hurrying, to catch a glimpse of the sea. See the soldiers all throwing themselves into each other's arms; see the generals and captains weeping tears of joy as they feel the killing burden of responsibility lifting from their shoulders. Am I exaggerating all this? Every detail that I have given is told by Xenophon's self—even to the beasts of burden, the horses, and the tears. While this scene cannot be duplicated in Xenophon for completeness of detail, still there are countless scenes sketched in outline which the teacher can fill in, if he will, and which Xenophon meant to be filled in by the imagination of his readers.

Still another example of a more quiet scene. For days Hannibal's army has been toiling up the icy precipices of the Alps. Unused to the rigor of such weather, without proper protection or supplies, harassed by day and by night by mountaineers, death staring them in the face day by day, and taking them off by the thousand, they pressed on, following blindly the man of iron to whom they had yielded their faith. At length they reach the summit. Let me give Livy's

words (XXI., xxxv.5): "Thru places all covered with snow the army began to move slowly at daybreak; weariness and desperation stood out on every countenance; when Hannibal, riding forward before the line, ordered the troops to halt on an eminence whence far and wide the view extended, and he points out Italy and the plains about the Po lying at the foot of the Alps. 'You are crossing the walls of Rome,' he says, 'not of Italy only—all the rest will be level or descending; and in one, or at most two, battles you will have in your power the capital of Italy.'"

In no respect does ancient historiography differ from modern more than in the insertion of set speeches in the narrative. In most cases these are in the direct form, with an elaborate setting—introductions of the speakers, descriptions of the auditors, etc. In Caesar these speeches are all given in the indirect form, but this is a caprice of style that may be, and probably is, due to the same intentional self-effacement that caused the use of the third person.

The object of the speech has been variously interpreted, but there seems to be no doubt that in it are given discussions of the various situations in which individuals or parties or armies appear. And the fact that the speech is made by a leader on one side or the other gives opportunity for an analysis of views, conditions, and impulses which would have been very dull if made by the historian himself. That is to say, the object of the speech form is again to make the narrative dramatic by bringing forward the chief characters as speakers. And when we remember what a part rhetorical as well as oratorical training had in the education of cultured men of that day, we need not be surprised to find these speeches made in most cases after the strictest rhetorical principles, with every regard to the production of the proper effect upon the audience.

The only conclusion possible, if this is true, is that the speech loses the greater part of its meaning if it is not rendered with due regard to its contents and to the effect designed. Very frequently, I regret to say, Hamlet's advice has been neglected in such matters; with the result that the speech has been regarded as a drearier waste in a desert of stupidity. We may admit that the speech is more difficult than the ordinary narrative; but it is more valuable, and contains more than the ordinary narrative. And a slight experience with the proper rendition of the words of the speaker will convince any candid teacher that the speeches contain a very important means of arousing interest. This may even take the form of actual declamation. I remember, in my own experience as a student, that the power of Demosthenes as an orator came over me fully only when I had committed to memory one of the *Philippics* and I had recited it with what power of interpretation I had. I found out then what one of those quick, insinuating questions meant; and I found out what must have been the effect of the roll of vituperation with which he crushed his opponents when the Greek vowels came pouring forth from his indignant lips. The same experience was duplicated in the case of Cicero; and what is true of the orator must

be true, in some measure at least, of the oratorical historian. The problem in the case of Caesar is complicated by the form of the speech, but the speech occupies too much relative space in the whole narrative not to be made the most of, even if, in some cases, it has to be transformed to the direct form to be made effective to the pupil.

The second principal heading to which I wish to allude is the imaginative interpretation of the form—the linguistic form. My text is the remark of another friend, who said to me that he had passed thru his whole course under a professor of Greek of national reputation, and had never heard any comment on the form of the authors read, beyond an occasional question as to a second aorist or a second perfect.

One of the most evident divergences between the classical tongues and our modern languages lies in the elaborate system of moods and tenses with which the classical language was provided. And for centuries some of the keenest minds have devoted their untiring efforts to discovering, by induction first and then by deduction, the fundamental meanings of these moods particularly; for we have tense relations in modern times. The earliest languages of which we have knowledge were even better provided with forms than Greek and Latin, and the conclusion seems to be that the people of these periods were in the habit of expressing by formal differences what later was left to the imagination or the gesture. In the course of time we have the syntax further developed, and complicated languages, like Greek and Latin, used in the hurry of daily association.

To say that the average Greek or Roman was fully conscious of all the shades of meaning which his various moods and tenses expressed would be absurd. Equally absurd would it be to deny a traditional employment of these forms for the expression of unconscious emotions in the proper way. I mean that if an average Roman would *wish*, he would use the optative subjunctive; and so thru the various categories of potential volitive, jussive,—each one being used more or less unconsciously as an inheritance adapted to the particular feeling that he had to express. If he had been asked to analyze, he would have been as much surprised as would his modern counterpart if stopped on the street and forced to explain why he used such and such a form when he spoke.

Far different from this unconscious employment of language is the conscious artistic employment of it by literary masters. We often speak nowadays of men who have a linguistic sense or feeling, by which we mean that they employ language with the fullest instinctive appreciation of what it will stand. They can play tricks with it, discover long-disused possibilities, bring out long-dormant beauties. Different is this language from that of the man of the street; just as distinctive is the fact that the reflective man, the historian, the philosopher, revel in the subordinate clause, while the wayfaring man, the workman, and the child cling affectionately, and hence tenaciously, to the antique parataxis.

In the works of Greek and Latin literature which we read in our schools and colleges, every word will repay close study. Every tense form, every word form, means more than the bare transfer into an approximate English equivalent would seem to indicate. There is a wealth of color, of flavor, of aroma, about every word, only to be brought out by study assisted by sympathy; and the degree with which the reader comes into sympathy with the author is the degree to which he is able to extract all the power from the written word.

The late L. Müller once explained his method of emending Horace somewhat as follows: He would steep himself for an indefinite period in Horace; have all that he wrote at his fingers' ends; think Horace, feel Horace, have him by him when he slept and when he waked. In a certain sense he became after a time the embodiment of Horace. Hence, when he came to any passage which was corrupt, his abnormally stimulated sense not merely detected the fault, but supplied at once the true reading. This seems to us to be extravagant, and it is; but it none the less carries with it the lesson which I have emphasized.

Let me give a few cases of what I think can be done by reading ourselves into an author. It is noteworthy that, as far as the tenses of the verb are concerned, there is a complete equipment only in the past sphere; that the present sphere is provided only with two tenses, and the future sphere for practical purposes only with one. If you reflect a moment, you will see that this is just as it should be. In the past alone can we apply the measuring rod of time. The present is a vanishing point, even when it has a long period stretching back in its wake. The future is that limitless realm peopled with our hopes, our fears, our reflections, and our fancies. And we no longer start as at a strange thing when the theoretical syntacticians tell us that in the essence the future is not a tense at all, but that it is a mood, and entitled to all the rights and privileges thereunto appertaining.

In the other spheres of time we have two great divisions into kinds of time: the durative or continuing; the complexive or completed. We speak very glibly of continuing action, of progress, but we do not stop to think that we speak in figures. All our words that indicate time, from old Father Time himself, are imaginative, figurative. And so it is with these tenses. The old Greeks said that a verb was a word that carried an image. This applies to all the tenses; but applied to the complexive tenses, it is the image of death; to the duration tenses, it is the image of life. An eminent syntactician has called the imperfect tense the tense of vision, the tense of evolution, because it is the tense that carries the activity forward, that gives us life. Here again, in some respects, we can come very nearly to mood, for continuance as a rule involves effort, and this to a certain extent involves resistance, and requires the *will* to accomplish it. It is particularly beautiful when the tense is negated, and according to the force of the subject we have an exultant "*would not*" or a despairing "*could not*." But even when there is no such connotation, and the mere image is before our eyes, we can gain much not merely

for our enjoyment, but for our comprehension, by visualizing. Read the magnificent 25th chapter of the 1st book of Tacitus for the effect that a single imperfect tense, standing forward in a prominent place, has in giving an instantaneous picture of a scene.² If an artist were called upon to illustrate Tacitus, there is no doubt but that this scene would be thrown upon his canvas.

The old Greeks, with the keenness that characterized all their reasoning, called the moods the *attitudes of the soul* ($\psi \chi \mu \alpha \delta \alpha \theta \epsilon \sigma \varsigma$). Can anything be either more appropriate or more illuminating? Grant that the average man could not have named his soul's feelings, the thinker and the seer were not so hindered. And he who would read the poet's soul must be able to use every key to the cipher of the poet's expression.

The subjunctive mood in Latin and the subjunctive and optative moods in Greek have long been a favorite field of study for classical students. The Latin subjunctive has played the predominant rôle because, combining as it did the functions of an optative and a subjunctive, it gained greatly in complexity and, of course, in difficulty. In fact, the proneness of the teachers of Latin to dwell on the subjunctive has been made the subject of a good deal of criticism, not always good-natured, on the part of the Philistines. How wrong their position is a few moments' reflection will show. If the Greeks were right in regarding the moods as showing the *ψυχικαὶ διαθέσεις* then the Latin subjunctive, combining Greek subjunctive and optative, is the mood which has, above all other moods, to do with man's self. The indicative is the mood of the external, the subjunctive that of the internal. The indicative gives the actual vision, the subjunctive the intellectual vision—always so much more vivid. The indicative is the mood of the world about us, the subjunctive that of the world in the heart. Would you command? Would you pray? Would you design? Would you love? Would you desire? Would you fear and dread? All this must be in the subjunctive. Nay, even would you reflect on the character of man, or read a nature into the nexus of things, the subjunctive comes to your help. And it is significant of the increasing reflectivity of the Roman people, that the subjunctive grows and grows continually in the Latin literature.

But sympathy and close attention are always needed for all such interpretation; and even with this, the author's exact meaning is often as elusive as the chances of misconception are boundless. Often it happens that the proper interpretation of a subjunctive throws a strong light upon a scene. Thus in *Livy*, I.xl. there is an account of the murder of the first Tarquin by two shepherds, instigated by the sons of *Ancus Marcius*. They make their way into the palace under a fictitious plea which they set before the king. One sets forth a long tale and draws the attention of the king to him.

⁴ Postquam vallum (Drusus) init, portas (milites) stationibus firmant, globos armatorum certis castrorum locis opperiri iubent; ceteri ingenti agmine circumveniunt. Stabat Drusus silentium manus poscens. Illi quoque oculos ad multitudinem rettulerunt, vocibus truculentis strepere, rursum viso Caesare trepidare: murmur incubent, atrox clamor et repente quies; diversis animorum motibus pavebant terribantque.

The other, waiting until the king is wholly absorbed, raises his ax and plants it in the king's skull. The whole effective part of the scene is the mental attitude of the one who was waiting to get an opportunity to strike. And this is expressed by a simple subjunctive.³

Accordingly, just as the dative is the personal case, as the imperfect is the personal tense, so the subjunctive is the personal mood; and all that an actor on the stage of a theater indicates by his acting the subjunctive does on the stage of literature. The indicative gives the deeds alone, the subjunctive furnishes the key to the characters who perform the deeds.

If this is true, then the careful study that scholars have given to the subjunctive is not misplaced. If this is true, we have at once the explanation as to why men continue to study the subjunctive. And it may be safely said that, so long as the competent criticism of the world pronounces the Greek and Roman authors great, so long will men of imagination and feeling find their greatest satisfaction in interpreting them to the utmost—which means, to the utmost nicety of expression.

We teachers, then, cannot expect to find our students obtaining the full benefit of their work in the classics if we direct their attention only to the mere accurate construction of sentences or to the mere careful memorizing of forms. We must both interpret ourselves and aid them to interpret. We must bring before their minds all the hidden beauties which these forms and constructions contain, and we must lead them to see the art in the expression of every idea.

Furthermore, as the life is more than food, and the body more than raiment, we must reveal to them that within this outward form, grandly artistic tho it be, there is an inner substance which is worth every effort to obtain, and which, to the persistent seeker, becomes of the greatest value for the training, not only of the mind, but of the spirit, and for the broadening, not of view merely, but of sympathy and appreciation for the struggles and the successes of mankind, the progress of civilization, the conservation, so to speak, of the energy of human endeavor.

TEACHERS COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

GONZALES LODGE

ACTUS CICERONIANUS

The rhetorical works of Cicero formed the subject matter of a scholarly exhibition in the College Auditorium of Saint Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, New York, on Sunday afternoon, March 23, when the members of the Graduating Class of that Jesuit House of Classical Studies presented an *Actus Ciceronianus*.

Mr. Philip S. Hurley read a most interesting and erudite essay on Cicero the Stylist.

The main event of the afternoon then followed, the *Actus Ciceronianus*, in which Mr. LaVerne F. Wilhelm presented the rhetorical works of Cicero for translation,

³Coerciti ab lictore et iussi in vicem dicere tandem obloqui desistunt; unus rem ex composito orditur. Dum intentus in eum se rex totus averteret, alter elatam securum in caput deiecit.—The normal Latin would require *dum* with the present indicative. But see how excellently the almost agonizing suspense of the assassin is shown by the mood. You are sure that the hand that held the ax trembled with the intensity of his feeling.

exposition, literary appreciation, and analysis. These works include *De Inventione Rhetorica*, *De Oratore*, *Orator*, *De Claris Oratoribus*, *De Partitione Oratoria*, *Topica*, and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*.

Three members of the Graduating Class proposed objections and argued against specific principles of rhetoric as expounded in these works of Cicero. Mr. Edward P. Higgins took exception to Cicero's explanation of the function of the exordium; Mr. Alvin A. Hufnagel objected to Cicero's contention that 'no man can be an orator unless he is morally good'; Mr. Joseph E. O'Neill impugned the oft-repeated statement of Cicero that 'rhetoric is an art'. These three objectors endeavored to base their arguments on Aristotle, Quintilian, and the other early rhetoricians, but the defendant clearly and concisely answered each argument, summoning to his aid not only these already quoted authorities, but numerous other classical passages.

At the conclusion of these objections the invited guests and the members of the Faculty proposed difficulties to Mr. Wilhelm, all of which he answered most successfully and succinctly. The scholarly exhibition lasted for one hour and a half, during which the audience, composed of the entire Jesuit student body and Faculty, and the invited guests, manifested their appreciation and interest by frequent applause.

The programme concluded with the singing, in Latin, by the entire audience, of *The Battle Hymn of The Republic*. The programme was printed in unique form (the *Actus* was held as a part of the *Vergilian Bimillennial Celebration*): a *Vergilian Kalendarium*, with a separate page for each month containing all the classical data, included as its center pages the programme of the *Actus Ciceronianus*.

ALOYSIUS J. HOGAN, S. J., *Dean*.

PHILADELPHIA CLASSICAL SOCIETY

The Board of Governors of the Philadelphia Classical Society has instituted an annual scholarship for travel and study in Italy. The scholarship (\$200) is to be awarded to a member of the Society who is engaged in teaching Latin, and it is recommended, but not required, that the money be used to help defray expenses of attending the Summer Session of the American Academy in Rome. The Italian Government will supply scholarship winners with official credentials.

The scholarship for the summer of 1930 has been awarded to Miss Frances de Mauriac, of the DuPont High School, Wilmington, Delaware.

WILLIAM PENN CHARTER SCHOOL, JOHN FLAGG GUMMERE
PHILADELPHIA